

## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 2, 2006.

Currently, new claims 21-39 are pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued rejections based on Omoigui (2005/0086688), Knee (5,589,982), Ozkan (5,946,045), and Blackketter (2005/0196136). Because none of these cited references, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of claims 21-39, Applicant asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance.

For example, claim 21 recites “receiving event data at customer premise equipment ... comparing said event data to an alert parameter at said customer premise equipment; and providing an alert for a user ...” where “said event data provides information about an event occurring within said program not currently being viewed.” These limitations are not disclosed in any of the cited prior art references.

Omoigui does not disclose the “comparing said event data to an alert parameter at said customer premise equipment.” Rather, Omoigui performs its comparison at encoder/server 14, which is remote from the customer premise equipment. [see Fig. 1, and paragraphs 0035 – 0037 of Omoigui].

Ozkan does not disclose the “comparing said event data to an alert parameter at said customer premise equipment.” Rather, Ozkan is about formatting of video data.

Blackketter does not disclose the “comparing said event data to an alert parameter at said customer premise equipment.” Rather, Blackketter is about scheduling the recording of television shows.

The Knee reference also does not disclose the “comparing said event data to an alert parameter at said customer premise equipment.” Rather, Knee is about electronic program guide technology

Because none of these cited references, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of claim 21, Applicant asserts that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Claims 22-39 are patentable over the cited prior art for similar reasons as claim 21.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 21-39 is

respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2006

By: /Burt Magen/  
Burt Magen  
Reg. No. 37,175

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105-4206  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665